DRAFT

Participant comments are requested.
Please reply to henningj@paesmtp.pae.osd.mil
or dean.illinger@js.pentagon.mil

MOOTW Conference Feedback

**Sponsored by the Analysis Council of the
Executive Committee for Modeling &
Simulation**

April 2, 1997

Feedback from MOOTW Workshop

At the start of the day, the MOOTW Workshop attendees identified the following three questions to monitor as the agenda unfolded:

- How should we improve the development of MOOTW requirements in JWARS?

- What should we do to identify and capture MOOTW requirements that are not currently in the JWARS documented set?

- How should we proceed with the evaluation of what it will take to implement requirements and the separation of requirements that are not implementable?

DRAFT

Proposed Recommendation

- Make official formation and support for the MOOTW User's Group under the JWARS umbrella high priority. Identify a leader.

- Request support from the research component of JWARS to examine the most feasible next step in support of MOOTW user group identified actions.

- MOOTW User's Group should consider the following:

  - The ability to capture PPBS and Acquisition impacts of MOOTW in JWARS is essential.

  - Employment/mission specific MOOTW needs to be considered as a whole -- not segregated, but not all activities need to be modeled explicitly in JWARS. Hartley/MORS briefing gives some insight into the set that may benefit from federates, specific tools, and other approaches.

  - MOOTW transition to warfare and conflict-like activities should be able to be modeled in JWARS.

DRAFT

Next Step Proposal

- An interim committee be formed to open the User's Group site and get members on distribution.   Recommend

  - Washington component of

    - Jackie Henningsen assisted by Jerome Visser, and Gene Visco to get initial linkages open.

  - Oversight component of

    - Lynda Jacques (PACOM) assisted by Dean Hartley and Mike Sovereign

- An example of a research topic has been proposed by the ACOM representative (see next page.) As soon as we are on line as a user's group, other ideas should be transmitted, reviewed and a strategy for pursuit of these efforts planned.

- Current model user's, developers, requirers will be requested to put discussion papers on the User's group site.

- Presentations from meeting be put on the web site. In progress.

DRAFT

Sample Research Proposal

- Suggestion from ACOM; other proposals are requested for User Group consideration.

- Examine the socio-economic modules used in Spectrum, RDSS, DEXES/CAM to see what algorithms are used, what assumptions are made in each model, what are the input variables and constants, how measurable are the variables (I.e. is it a scale of 1 to 100 or a value such as inflation of 3%), how do the algorithms interact with other parts of the model.

- Other considerations: What would it take to make a training model analytic -- is that the direction to consider?

MOOTW & QDR: Common Threads

- **As this group was looking at MOOTW a couple issues related to the QDR were considered.**

  - QDR has recognized that military forces will be transitioning into Major Theater War from engagements rather than exclusively from CONUS. The implications for lift, force availability and support availability are being examed. The Joint Staff led wargame, Dynamic Commitment has been used to explore issues that relate to this transitioning.

  - Small Scale Contingencies, even without a combat component, consume critical logistic forces and equipment, the resulting impact on MTW must be capturable in a warfighting model in order to understand the ability to execute the strategy. A presentation on the influence of different problem areas related to multiple small scale contingencies was provided to the participants. More information will be provided in follow-on materials.

DRAFT